

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 5, 14 and 16 have been amended and new independent claim 21 added. Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 12-14 and 16-21 are pending in the application.

Filed separately herewith is Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 in the amount of \$510.00 for a three-month Petition for Extension of Time (also filed separately herewith). If the amount is in error and/or additional fees are needed, the Patent and Trademark Office is authorized to debit or credit, as appropriate, Deposit Account No. 06-1358.

Claim Objections

Claim 16 has been objected to because of a formality with regard to the lack of antecedent basis for the term “the group” in the claim. Therefore, claim 16, line 2 has been amended to recite “a group” rather than “the group”.

Rejections Under 35 USC §112

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC §112 for failure to provide proper antecedent basis for the reference to “the status” in claim 1 as identified on page 2, line 12, word 9. In that regard, the claim has been amended to refer to “a status” rather than “the status” in line with the Examiner’s request. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is no longer rejectable under 35 USC §112.

Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 13, 14 and 17 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,901,430 (Smith). The Examiner takes the position that all of the elements recited in those claims are found in the Smith patent.

Claim 1 has been amended to further distinctly claim and point out that which the Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to refer to the management systems as computer network management systems and to refer to the operating events as operating events in need of correction. The claim also calls for a management interface system receiving the management data from the plurality of computer network management systems.

A portal system is coupled to the management interface system. This portal system receives the management data from the plurality of computer network management systems and presents the management data in a predetermined format.

A client view system is coupled to the portal system. The client view system provides a single browser work space for receiving the management data and simultaneously generates client view data in the form of a plurality of application view windows for displaying a status of the enterprise network on a real time basis in the single browser work space.

Finally, a workflow system is coupled to the portal system. The workflow system receives the management data from the plurality of computer network management systems and provides one or more workflows in response to the management data. The workflows provide corrective measures that correct monitored operating events that are in need of correction.

This is to be contrasted with the Smith reference which essentially shows an online system for locating consumer products in an enterprise production pipeline. The patent is also concerned with inventory control. In that regard, what the Examiner characterizes as a plurality of management systems as identified in Figure 3 are merely databases that provide data with regard to customers and inventory items. None of the databases identified by the Examiner

provide management data concerning monitored operating events that are in need of correction.

In fact, the Smith patent provides no teaching of this requirement of amended claim 1.

The Examiner identifies the claimed client view system as a way for users to view images or pages. However, nowhere does the Examiner identify in the Smith patent the ability of providing a client view system that provides a single browser workspace for receiving management data and simultaneously generating client view data in the form of a plurality of application view windows for displaying a status of the enterprise network on a real time basis in the single browser workspace. All Smith teaches is the customary display of information on a single user window. Finally, the workflow system 622 identified by the Examiner in the Smith patent does not perform any corrective measures. All it does is identify and confirm orders by consumers as rightly stated by the Examiner.

In amended claim 1, the workflow system receives the management data from the plurality of computer network management systems and provides one or more workflows in response to the management data. Of particular importance in claim 1 is that the workflows provide corrective measures that correct monitored operating events that are in need of correction. No such teaching is provided in the Smith patent.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the Smith patent may no longer be rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Smith.

Claims 4-7, 9 and 13 can trace their dependence to claim 1 and as such incorporate the limitations of that claim. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims likewise may no longer be rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Smith.

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Smith. In that regard, claim 14 has been amended to further distinctly claim and point out that which the Applicants regard as their invention.

The claim has been amended to point out that the management systems including web pages that display management data for the enterprise network. The claim also points out that the web pages of each management system produce management data concerning monitored operating events that are in need of correction.

According to claim 14 the amended method includes the steps of receiving the management data from the web pages of the management system and presenting the management data in a predetermined format. The next step is to receive the management data in the predetermined format and generate client view data in the form of a plurality of a simultaneously displayed view windows in a single browser workspace and display the status of the enterprise network on a real time basis in the single browser workspace. Finally, the claim calls for the step of providing one or more workflows in response to the management data, the workflows providing corrective measures that correct monitored operating events that are in need of correction thereby managing the enterprise network.

Since this claim generally follows the outline for the system defined in claim 1, the comments previously presented with regard to claim 1 likewise apply to claim 14. Claim 14 further adds that the management systems contain web pages for displaying the management data.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 may no longer be rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Smith.

Claim 17 can trace its dependence to claim 14 and as such incorporates the limitations of that claim. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that in light of the previous comments, claim 17 is likewise in condition for allowance and may no longer be rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Smith.

Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Dependent claims 6, 7 and 12 have been rejected under 35 USC §103 as being obvious over Smith in view of U.S. Patent 6,609,108 (Pulliam) for the reasons specifically set forth on pages 7-9 of the Office Action. In light of the fact that these claims are dependent claims, and trace their dependence to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that in light of the previously presented arguments, these claims may no longer be rejected under 35 USC §103 as being obvious over Smith in view of Pulliam.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and its dependent claims 4-7, 9 12 and 13 are in condition for allowance and are neither anticipated nor made obvious by any of the references of record taken alone or in combination.

Claims 16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being obvious over Smith in view of Pulliam. Since all of these claims are dependent claims which trace their dependence to claim 14, it is respectfully submitted that in light of the comments previously presented with regard to claim 14, these dependent claims may no longer be rejected under 35 USC §103 as being obvious over Smith in view of Pulliam.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 and its dependent claims 16 - 20 are in condition for allowance and are neither anticipated nor made obvious by any of the references of record taken alone or in combination.

Conclusion

Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions after review this Amendment, he is cordially invited to call the undersigned representative so that this case may receive an early Notice of Allowance.

Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By: 

Allen S. Melser

Registration No. 27,215

Date: December 1, 2005
Customer No. 000,136
400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 638-6666